

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

35 USC § 103

Claims 9 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over Adler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,270,937) in view of Wilson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,370,851). The applicant disagrees for various reasons.

As amended, claim 9 expressly requires that "...the *source of liquid carbon dioxide comprises an autorefrigeration unit* that is configured to *receive and expand the overhead vapor to liquefy the carbon dioxide and to produce work*, and that is *further configured to separating the liquid carbon dioxide from the overhead vapor...*"

These elements are neither taught nor suggested by Adler or Wilson. For the lack of at least these elements, the rejection is improper and should not be maintained.

With respect to the examiner's argument that Wilson would teach a desiccant "coated with a carbonyl sulfide hydrolysis catalyst (column 4, line 60-65)..." it is noted that Wilson is concerned with crystalline silicoalumino phosphate molecular sieves having the formula $aR:(Si_uAl_vP_w)_O_2:bH_2$ in which suitable sources of phosphorous for the production of the catalyst are discussed in column 4, line 60-65. Therefore, Wilson is entirely devoid of any teaching that a desiccant would be coated with a carbonyl sulfide hydrolysis catalyst as alleged by the examiner.

Consequently, claims 9 and 12 can not be properly held obvious over the cited art and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/550,054
Amdt. dated Apr. 29, 2010
Reply to Office action of Feb. 3, 2010

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

Claims 9 and 12 are pending in this application, with claims 1-8 and 13-21 being withdrawn. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Fish & Associates, PC

By: /Martin Fessenmaier/
Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,697
Tel.: (949) 943-8307